1	PATRICIA BARBOSA, Esq. (SBN 1258 MICHELLE UZETA, Esq. (SBN 164402	65))
2	BARBOSA, METZ & HARRISON, LL 17547 Ventura Blvd., Suite 310	ĹP
3	Encino, CA 91316	33.0 °CEE —
4	Tel: (818) 386-1200 Fax: (818) 386-1212	
5	PBarbosa@bmhlegal.com MUzeta@bmhlegal.com	
6	9	-9 PM
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff, CHRISTY RUDDER	2: 33 CALIF
8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
9	CENTRAL DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
10 11		
12	CHRISTY RUDDER,	947411-00862JVS(PNB)
13	Plaintiff,	Civil Rights
14)) COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE
15	VS.) RELIEF AND DAMAGES: FOR
16	BEVERY HILLS FARM, INC, dba THE) DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION IN) VIOLATION OF TITLE III OF THE
17	FARM OF BEVERLY HILLS; LA LIVE PROPERTIES, LLC; and DOES 1	,
18	through 10, Inclusive,) ACT AND CALIFORNIA'S CIVIL) RIGHTS STATUTES (Health & Safety
19	Defendants.) Code § 19955 et seq. and Civil Code
20) § 51,)
21) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
22)
23		
24		
25	///	
26	///	
27	///	
28		
	ADA (TIT. III) COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RE	LIEF AND DAMAGES

Plaintiff CHRISTY RUDDER complains of Defendants BEVERY HILLS FARM, INC, dba THE FARM OF BEVERLY HILLS; LA LIVE PROPERTIES, LLC; and DOES 1 through 10, Inclusive, and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION:

- 1. Over twenty years ago, President Bush signed the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), establishing the most important civil rights law for persons with disabilities in our country's history. One of the principal goals of the ADA is the integration of people with disabilities into the country's economic and social life. 42 U.S.C. § 12101(a) Despite this long-standing mandate, Defendants the owners, operators, lessors and lessees of The Farm of Beverly Hills in Los Angeles, California have failed to provide disabled persons with full and equal access to their goods and services in violation of the ADA by constructing and/or failing to remove architectural barriers that prevent persons who use wheelchairs from being able to use and enjoy their facilities in a full and equal manner as able-bodied persons. In so doing, Defendants have also violated California civil rights laws including Health and Safety Code § 19955 et seq.; and the Unruh Civil Rights Act ("Unruh Act"), Cal. Civ. Code § 51 et seq.
- 2. As a result of Defendants' discriminatory acts and omissions, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages, and has been, and will continue to be prevented and/or deterred from accessing and using Defendants' goods, services and facilities to the same extent as, and in a manner equal to, her able-bodied peers. Through this lawsuit, Plaintiff seeks compensation for her injuries and an injunction requiring Defendants to provide "full and equal" access to their public facilities for disabled persons as required by law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE:

3. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331

- for violations of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq*. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, attendant and related causes of action, arising from the same facts, are also brought under California law, including but not limited to violations of California Health & Safety Code §19955 *et seq*.; and the Unruh Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 51 *et seq*.
- 4. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in the Central District and that Plaintiff's causes of action arose in the Central District.

PARTIES:

- 5. Plaintiff CHRISTY RUDDER ("Plaintiff") is, and at all times relevant herein was, a qualified individual with a physical "disability" as defined under Department of Justice regulation 28 CFR § 36.104 and California Government Code § 12926. Plaintiff is unable to independently stand or walk, and has limited range of motion in her arms as the result of injuries sustained in car accidents, and requires the use of a wheelchair for mobility. Plaintiff is unable, due to her physical disability, to independently use public facilities that are not designed and/or constructed in compliance with applicable accessibility standards to accommodate disabled persons who require a wheelchair for mobility. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a resident of California.
- 6. On information and belief, Defendants BEVERY HILLS FARM, INC, dba THE FARM OF BEVERLY HILLS; LA LIVE PROPERTIES, LLC; and DOES 1 through 10, Inclusive (collectively "Defendants"), are, and at all times relevant herein were, the owners, operators, lessors and/or lessees of The Farm of Beverly Hills ("The Farm"), a restaurant located at 800 West Olympic Boulevard, Suite A 150, Los Angeles, CA 90015.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants is the agent, ostensible agent, alter ego, master, servant, trustor, trustee, employer, employee, representative, franchiser, franchisee, lessor, lessee, joint venturer, parent, subsidiary, affiliate, related entity, partner, and/or associate, or such similar capacity, of each of the other Defendants, and was at all times acting and performing, or failing to act or perform, within the course and scope of such similar aforementioned capacities, and with the authorization, consent, permission or ratification of each of the other Defendants, and is personally responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions of the other Defendants in proximately causing the violations and damages complained of herein, and have participated, directed, and have ostensibly and/or directly approved or ratified each of the acts or omissions of each of the other Defendants, as herein described. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of Defendants DOES 1 through 10, inclusive are ascertained.

FACTS UPON WHICH ALL CLAIMS ARE BASED

8. The Farm of Beverly Hills is one of many restaurants located in "L.A. Live", a vibrant sports and entertainment district in the heart of downtown Los Angeles anchored by the STAPLES Center and Nokia Theatre. "L.A. Live" was newly constructed starting in 2005, with The Farm promoting itself as "a comfort food haven for the hard working downtown crowd". Boasting an indoor/outdoor fireplace in the bar and patio and a private dining room, The Farm is a popular eating spot for Los Angeles residents, commuters, guests and tourists. Seating available for guests includes booth and table seating, separate seating in the Bar with a television, outdoor seating area with an outdoor fireplace, and patio seating to view the passersby. Unfortunately, although constructed fifteen years after the effective date of Title III of the ADA, The Farm does not offer its disabled guests the full and equal experience it offers to its able-bodied guests.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 9. The Farm is a "place of public accommodation" as defined under Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. 12181(7)(B), and California civil rights laws. Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51 *et seq.*; and Health & Saf. Code § 19955 *et seq.*
- 10. Plaintiff and other similarly situated physically disabled persons who require the use of a wheelchair or other mobility device, are unable to use the different facilities and amenities offered at The Farm on a "full and equal" basis unless they are brought into compliance with Title III, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; Health & Safety Code § 19955 *et seq.*; and California Code of Regulations, Title 24-2 ("Title 24-2"), all of which are designed to ensure full and equal access for persons with disabilities in places of public accommodation. Plaintiff is a member of that portion of the public whose rights are protected by these laws.
- 11. Plaintiff visited The Farm twice on or about April 17, 2010, while participating in the 2010 Democratic Convention at the Los Angeles Convention Center. In the morning, Plaintiff visited The Farm seeking something quick to eat before starting her work at the convention. When she arrived she was told by staff that there was no seating available in the main dining area. Plaintiff asked if she could be seated in the Bar area adjacent to the main dining room, where she saw two persons sitting, but was advised by staff that there was no Bar seating available for her, as she was in a wheelchair and the Bar tables were raised too high for a wheelchair user to sit. Plaintiff observed that the Bar area seating consisted of all high benches and tables that were inaccessible to her as a wheelchair user. Although Plaintiff saw a lowered section at the end of the Bar, it was separated from the rest of the Bar seating, and was being used by the staff/servers to place their food and drinks, and had a computer sitting on it for use by staff. Staff did not offer to have Plaintiff sit in the lowered portion of the Bar, or offer her any other seating areas. Because there was no seating available in the main dining room and the Bar tables were inaccessible, Plaintiff left The Farm, disappointed, embarrassed and without being

served.

- 12. Later that same day, Plaintiff was asked to go to lunch with the candidate from her district and a few of his staff. Plaintiff was still interested in dining at The Farm, so when the party chose to go there for lunch, Plaintiff went along with the choice. Upon arriving at The Farm, Plaintiff and her party were seated in the main dining area. Plaintiff was seated at the end of a booth, which meant that her wheelchair protruded into the aisle way, and was in the way of people passing behind her who jostled and pressed against her chair. Plaintiff felt conspicuous and embarrassed that she was drawing unwanted attention as staff and patrons had to squeeze behind her to pass. On information and belief, all of the tables in the dining room and on the patio are inaccessible as the pedestal-style bases on all of the tables block the foot pedals on wheelchairs from rolling fully under the table.
- 13. Before being served, Plaintiff needed to use the restroom. She found that she could not open the door to the women's restroom as it was too heavy for her. A woman exiting the restroom opened the door for her so she could enter. Once inside, Plaintiff found she could not wash her hands or use the hand dryer while seated in her wheelchair. Plaintiff could not reach the sink, as there was a wooden bench blocking its access. Plaintiff asked another woman in the restroom to help her move the bench so she could reach the sink. However, even when the bench was moved Plaintiff experienced barriers using the trough-style sink, as it did not have sufficient knee clearance to accommodate her wheelchair. The soap dispensers were mounted too high and out of reach for Plaintiff. The woman who had previously assisted Plaintiff took soap from a high dispenser and put it into Plaintiff's hands so she could wash her hands. After struggling to rinse her hands in the trough sink, Plaintiff found that there were no paper towels to dry her hands. Instead there was a mounted hand dryer that required her to raise her hands over her head and drop them into the top of the dryer. Plaintiff was unable to use the hand dryer correctly, and when she attempted to

- 14. On information and belief there are other access barriers and discriminatory policies, in addition to those described above, that exclude and deter Plaintiff from enjoying full and equal access to and use of the same goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations offered by The Farm to the general public, including, *but not limited to*:
 - Incorrect and insufficient International Symbol of Access signage;
 - Hostess and take-out counters that are too high;
 - Insufficient space in the outdoor fireplace lounge for wheelchair users to sit with able-bodied persons;
 - Insufficient path of travel for wheelchair users to sit in the side patio to watch passersby; and
 - Insufficient path of travel for wheelchair users to, through and within the restaurant, and outdoor patio
- 15. Upon leaving The Farm after lunch on or about April 17, 2010, Plaintiff attempted to inform the staff of the barriers in the restroom and dining areas, but the staff was too busy to listen to her, and failed to direct her to a responsible employee. When told that the bench in the women's restroom blocked access to the sink, the staff persons acknowledged that they knew about this barrier, and left Plaintiff with no response to her request for the bench to be removed. On information and belief, Defendants have been on notice that the seating, the Bar and the restrooms all have significant barriers that deny, deter or exclude Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities from enjoying the full and equal experience offered by Defendants, and have taken no action to remove these barriers.

- 16. Plaintiff has returned to the convention center on multiple occasions after the events set forth in this Complaint, to participate in seminars, conferences and the 2010 and 2011 Abilities Expos. Plaintiff wanted to dine at The Farm with her friends during her visits to the Convention Center, but was deterred from doing so due to her knowledge that the Bar, the seating in the dining room and the bathrooms were inaccessible to her and other persons using wheelchairs or other mobility devices, and did not want to subject herself or other disabled persons to discrimination at The Farm until the barriers were removed.
- 17. Plaintiff would like to be able to fully access, use and enjoy the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of The Farm, but has been excluded and deterred from doing so due to the access barriers she has encountered, which discriminate against her and deter her from using The Farm's facilities. Until these barriers are removed, Plaintiff will continue to suffer discrimination by being excluded and deterred from returning to The Farm, and will continue to be denied full and equal access to and use of the same goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations offered by The Farm to the general public.
- 18. As the result of Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein described, Plaintiff was, and will continue to be denied full and equal access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of The Farm and has suffered discrimination, humiliation, pain, emotional distress, and embarrassment, all to her damage. The ongoing nature of Defendants' discrimination constitutes an ongoing violation, and unless enjoined by this Court, will result in ongoing and irreparable injury.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT – TITLE III 42 USC §12101 et seq.

19. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again

herein, the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 18 of this Complaint, and incorporates them herein as if separately repled.

- 20. In 1990 the United States Congress found that laws were needed to more fully protect "some 43 million Americans with one or more physical or mental disabilities; that historically society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities", and that "such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem; that the nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency for such individuals; and that the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous." 42 U.S.C. §12101.
- 21. Congress stated as its purpose in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §12101(b):

It is the purpose of this act:

- (1) to provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (2) to provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (3) to ensure that the Federal government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established in this act on behalf of individuals with disabilities; and
- (4) to invoke the sweep of Congressional authority, including the power to enforce the 14th Amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day to day by people with disabilities.

- 22. As part of the ADA, Congress passed "Title III Public Accommodations and Services Operated by Private Entities." 42 U.S.C. 12181 *et seq.* Among "private entities" which are considered "public accommodations" for purposes of this title are "restaurants". 42 U.S.C. §12181(7)(B)
- 23. Title III of the ADA provides that "No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation." 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).
- 24. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of her disability in violation of Title III of the ADA and its implementing regulations. Defendants' discriminatory conduct includes, but is not limited to:
 - A. Discriminatory exclusion and/or denial of goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, accommodations, and/or opportunities;
 - B. Provision of goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and/or accommodations that are not equal to those afforded non-disabled individuals;
 - C. Failing to design and/or construct facilities built for first occupancy after January 26, 1993 so that they are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities in accordance with the ADA Standards for Accessible Design (ADA Standards), 28 C.F.R. pt. 36, app. A. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1); 28 C.F.R. §§ 36.401, 36.406(a); Since January 26, 1992, failing to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facilities are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities in accordance with the ADA Standards. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2); 28 C.F.R. §§ 36.402, 36.403, 36.406(a);

D. Since July 26, 1991, failing to comply with the ongoing obligation to remove barriers, and/or provide path of travel upgrades to remove barriers at facilities where such removal is "readily achievable." 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a)(2)(A)(iv); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

Pursuant to the remedies, procedures, and rights set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 12188 and 42 U.S.C. § 12205, Plaintiff prays for judgment as set forth below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 19955 et seq.

- 25. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 24 of this Complaint, and incorporates them herein as if separately repled.
- 26. California Health & Safety Code §§ 19955 et seq. was enacted "[t]o ensure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with §4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code." Such public accommodations are defined as any "building, structure, facility, complex, or improved area that is used by the general public...," and includes restaurants and related sanitary facilities, shopping centers and related sanitary facilities, and curbs and sidewalks intended for public use. California Health & Safety Code § 19955.
- 27. On information and belief, The Farm and its related facilities underwent construction and/or alterations after January 1, 1982 that triggered access requirements under Title 24-2. Pursuant to Title 24-2, compliance with disabled access building standards and specifications is required whenever public accommodations, such as The Farm and their related facilities, undergo an "alteration, structural repair or addition."

Pursuant to the remedies, procedures, and rights set forth in Health & Safety Code § 19953, Plaintiff prays for judgment as set forth below.

2

4

5

6

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (Cal. Civ. Code §51 et seq.)

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations 28. contained in Paragraphs 1 through 27 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 29. The Farm is a business establishments and, as such, must comply with the provisions of the Unruh Act, Cal. Civ. Code, § 51, et seq.
- The Unruh Act guarantees, inter alia, that persons with disabilities are 30. entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(b)
- The Unruh Act also provides that a violation of the ADA, or of 31. California state accessibility regulations, is a violation of the Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).
- 32. Defendants have violated the Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff's rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services offered at The Farm.
- Defendants have also violated the Unruh Act by denying, or aiding or 33. inciting the denial of, Plaintiff's rights to equal access arising from the provisions of the California state accessibility regulations and the ADA.

Pursuant to the remedies, procedures, and rights set forth in Cal. Civ. Code § 52, Plaintiff prays for judgment as set forth below.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests:

- That this Court issue an injunction pursuant to Title III of the ADA and 1. Plaintiff's related state law claims:
 - Ordering Defendants to alter their facilities to make such facilities A. readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities;

and 1 Prohibiting operation of Defendants' public accommodations and В. 2 facilities until they provide full and equal access to physically 3 disabled persons, and requiring that such access be immediately 4 provided. 5 That this Court award general, compensatory, and statutory damages 6 2. pursuant to the Unruh Act in an amount within the jurisdiction of this court, and that 7 8 these damages be trebled according to statute; That this Court award special and consequential damages according to 3. proof; 10 11 That this Court award attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs of 4. suit, pursuant to Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12205; California Civil Code §§ 12 52, and 55; California Health & Safety Code § 19953; and California Code of Civil 13 14 Procedure § 1021.5; Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper. 15 5. 16 Dated: June 2, 2011 17 BARBOSA, METZ & HARRISON, LLP 18 19 By: PATRICIA BARBOSA, Esq. 20 MICHELLE UZETA, Esq. 21 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Christy Rudder 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiff hereby demands a jury for all claims for which a jury is permitted. Dated: June $\frac{9}{2}$, 2011 BARBOSA, METZ & HARRISON, LLP Burbash By: PATRICIA BARBOSA, Esq. MICHELLE UZETA, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff, Christie Rudder

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been ass	igned to District Judge J	ames V. Selna	and the assigned
discovery Magistrate Judge i	s Robert N. Block.		

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV11- 862 JVS (RNBx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge				
	======			

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

LJ	Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	[X]	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	LI	Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 1 Riverside, CA 92501	134
----	---	-----	---	----	--	-----

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Patricia Barbosa, Esq. (SBN: 125865) Michelle Uzeta Esq. (SBN 164402) Barbosa, Metz & Harrison, LLP 17547 Ventura Blvd, Suite 310 Encino, CA 91316 Tel: 818-386-1200, Fax: 818-386-1212 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CHRISTY RUDDER, CASE NUMBER SACV11-00862 PLAINTIFF(S) BEVERY HILLS FARM, INC, dba THE FARM OF BEVERLY HILLS; LA LIVE PROPERTIES, LLC; **SUMMONS** and DOES 1 through 10, Inclusive, DEFENDANT(S). TO: DEFENDANT(S): A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it), you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached ✓ complaint □ _____ amended complaint □ counterclaim □ cross-claim or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney. Patricia Barbosa & Michelle Uzeta, whose address is 17547 Ventura Blvd, Suite 310, Encino, CA 91316 __. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court. Clerk, U.S. District Court Dated: _____ JUN - 9 2011 (Seal of the Court) [Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].

SUMMONS

CV-01A (12/07)

Patricia Barbosa, Esq. (SBN: 125865) Michelle Uzeta Esq. (SBN 164402) Barbosa, Metz & Harrison, LLP 17547 Ventura Blvd, Suite 310 Encino, CA 91316 Tel: 818-386-1200, Fax: 818-386-1212	
UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTY RUDDER,	CASE NUMBER
PLAINTIFF(S) · v.	SACVII-00862 TVS (PNEX)
BEVERY HILLS FARM, INC, dba THE FARM OF BEVERLY HILLS; LA LIVE PROPERTIES, LLC; and DOES 1 through 10, Inclusive, DEFENDANT(S).	SUMMONS
TO: DEFENDANT(S):	
A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summon must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached of the counterclaim cross-claim or a motion under Rule 1 or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, Part 17547 Ventura Blvd, Suite 310, Encino, CA 91316 judgment by default will be entered against you for the region your answer or motion with the court.	2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer tricia Barbosa & Michelle Uzeta, whose address is . If you fail to do so,
JUN - 9 2011 Dated:	By: Deputy Clerk (Seal of the Court)
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	s agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed
CV-01A (12/07) SUMM	MONS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

			CIVIL COVE	KSHEET			
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check bo CHRISTY RUDDER,		DEFENDANTS BEVERY HILLS FARM, INC, dba THE FARM OF BEVERLY HILLS; LA LIVE PROPERTIES, LLC; and DOES 1 through 10, Inclusive					
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, A yourself, provide same.)	ddress and Telephone Number. If y	you are	representing	Attorneys (If Known)			
Barbosa, Metz, & Harriso	BN: 125865), Michelle Uzeta, Esq on, LLP, 17547 Ventura Blvd, Suit 818-386-1200, Fax: 818-386-1212	te 310	164402)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTIO	N (Place an X in one box only.)		III. CITIZENS	HIP OF PRINCIPAL PA	RTIES -	For Diversity Cases	s Only
			(Place an X	in one box for plaintiff ar	nd one for o	defendant.)	
☐ 1 U _a S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S., Government Not a Party	·)	Citizen of This S	PTF DEF PTF DEF Citizen of This State □ 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place □ 4 □ 4 of Business in this State			
☐ 2 U _s S _s Government Defendar	of Parties in Item III)	enship	Citizen of Anoth	er State	2 🗆 2	Incorporated and of Business in A	I Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 nother State
			Citizen or Subject	ct of a Foreign Country []3 □3	Foreign Nation	□6 □6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or	ne box only.)						
Original 2 Remove State C		_	instated or □ 5 opened	Transferred from another	district (sp	Distr	• •
V. REOUESTED IN COMPL	AINT: JURY DEMAND:	Yes □	No (Check 'Yes'	only if demanded in com	olaint.)		
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C	/			IONEY DEMANDED IN		AINT: \$	
	te the U.S. Civil Statute under which	ch vou a					atutes unless diversity.)
	disabled person in violation of Ti			o a crior statement or easi	50 1101		
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place	ce an X in one box only.)						
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	V/W253	TORTS	TORTS	150 THE R	PRISONER	LABOR
☐ 400 State Reapportionment	□ 110 Insurance	PER	SONAL INJURY	AND AND DESCRIPTIONS OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	1153	PETITIONS	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards
□ 410 Antitrust	□ 120 Marine		Airplane	PROPERTY	□ 510	Motions to	Act
☐ 430 Banks and Banking	□ 130 Miller Act	□ 315	Airplane Product			Vacate Sentence	☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt.
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC	☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	□ 220	Liability Assault, Libel &	☐ 371 Truth in Lend		Habeas Corpus	Relations
Rates/etc.	□ 150 Recovery of	L1 320	Slander	☐ 380 Other Persona Property Dam		General Death Penalty	☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting &
☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced	Overpayment & Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed, Employers'	☐ 385 Property Dam			Disclosure Act
and Corrupt	Judgment		Liability	Product Liabil		Other	☐ 740 Railway Labor Act
Organizations	☐ 151 Medicare Act		Marine	BANKRUPTCY	-	Civil Rights	☐ 790 Other Labor
☐ 480 Consumer Credit	☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	□ 345	Marine Product	☐ 422 Appeal 28 US	C 🗆 555	Prison Condition	
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	Student Loan (Excl.	□ 350	Liability Motor Vehicle	158			☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.
☐ 810 Selective Service	Veterans)		Motor Vehicle	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28		PENALTY	Security Act
□ 850 Securities/Commodities/			Product Liability	USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS		Agriculture Other Food &	PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights
Exchange ☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12	Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	□ 360	Other Personal	441 Voting	020	Drug	□ 830 Patent
USC 3410	☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	□ 362	Injury Personal Injury-	☐ 442 Employment	□ 625	Drug Related	☐ 840 Trademark
☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	☐ 190 Other Contract	502	Med Malpractice	- A40 tr : /A		Seizure of	SOCIAL SECURITY
☐ 891 Agricultural Act	☐ 195 Contract Product	□ 365	Personal Injury-	mmodations		, ,	
☐ 892 Economic Stabilization	Liability		Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare		881	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)
Act	☐ 196 Franchise	□ 368	Asbestos Persona			Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck	(405(g))
☐ 893 Environmental Matters	REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation		Injury Product Liability	Disabilities - Employment		Airline Regs	□ 864 SSID Title XVI
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act	220 Foreclosure	IN	MIGRATION	446 American with		Occupational	□ 865 RSI (405(g))
□ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-	☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment			Disabilities -		Safety /Health	FEDERAL TAX SUITS
nation Under Equal	☐ 240 Torts to Land		Application	Other	□ 690	Other	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff
Access to Justice	☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	□ 463	Habeas Corpus	☐ 440 Other Civil			or Defendant)
☐ 950 Constitutionality of	☐ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 465	Alien Detainee Other Immigration	Rights	- [871 IRS-Third Party 26
State Statutes		-+03	Actions				USC 7609
		-					
	SACV11-00862						

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? In No Yes If yes, list case number(s):							
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? If yes, list case number(s):							
(Check all boxes that apply) ☐ A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐ D.	Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case: (Check all boxes that apply)						
(a) List the County in this District; □ Check here if the government, it	California County o	utside of this District; State i	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. f this box is checked, go to item (b).				
County in this District:*		200	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
CHRISTIE RUDDER- Orange C	County						
(b) List the County in this District; € Check here if the government, it	California County of s agencies or emplo	utside of this District; State i	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).				
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
All Defendants- Los Angeles County							
(c) List the County in this District; (County in Inland condemnation ca			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.				
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
Los Angeles County							
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us	dino, Riverside, Ve	entura, Santa Barbara, or S	San Luis Obispo Counties				
	X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER): Date June 08 2011						
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The CV-71 (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)							
Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:							
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	of Cause of Action				
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))					
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)					
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))					

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2

Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))

U.S.C.(g))

DIWW

SSID

RSI

863

864

865

All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security

All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42